Applicant: Shunpei Yamazaki et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-0228001 / US7116

Serial No.: 10/826,920 Filed: April 19, 2004

Page : 9 of 12

### **REMARKS**

In view of the following remarks and the foregoing amendments, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, 23, 24 and 29-36 are now pending, of which claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are independent. Claims 4, 10, 16, 22, and 25-28 were previously cancelled. Claims 29-32 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19have been amended. No new matter is presented (e.g., for support, see specification at Embodiment mode 1; Fig. 1; page 14, lines 12-16).

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-24, and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. In addition, these claims are rejected as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 13-15, 17, 21, 23-24, 29 and 31-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arai (U.S. Patent Publication No. US2002/0009538) in view of Aoshima (Japanese Patent Publication No. JP2000-223269).

Claims 7-9, 11-12 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Arai in view of Aoshima and Konuma (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0030443).

# 35 U.S.C. 112 – Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-24, and 29-32

Without submitting to the propriety of the rejection, Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 have been amended to delete the phrase "wherein the installation chamber comprises a mechanism for setting an evaporation material in each of the first, second, and third evaporation sources in the installation chamber." These amendments are believed to fully address the rejection. Accordingly, applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant: Shunpei Yamazaki et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-0228001 / US7116

Serial No.: 10/826,920 Filed: April 19, 2004 Page: 10 of 12

# 35 U.S.C. 103(a) – Claims 1-3, 5-6, 13-15, 17, 21, 23-24, 29 and 31-32

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-6, 13-15, 17, 21, 23-24, 29 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai in view of Aoshima, applicants respectfully submit that neither Arai nor Aoshima, nor any proper combination of the two, discloses or properly suggests all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 13 and 19, as amended.

Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 have been amended to recite a new feature, "wherein an evaporation is performed while at least one of the means adapted to move the first, second, and third evaporation sources moves in the film formation chamber."

For claims 1, 13, and 19, paragraph 8 of the Office Action asserts that Arai discloses an interior transferring mechanism, and refers to paragraph 52 of Arai for this disclosure. However, even assuming for the sake of argument that this assertion is correct, applicants submit that Arai does not disclose or properly suggest, "wherein an evaporation is performed while at least one of the means adapted to move the first, second, and third evaporation sources moves in the film formation chamber," as recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 19.

Arai teaches a method of manufacturing a light-emitting device by forming a thin film by the method of filling a small molecular organic electroluminescence material into an evaporation cell, and heating the material in an inert gas atmosphere to form a light emitting layer on a substrate (Arai: Abstract). In regards to Fig. 1, Arai discloses a gasification evaporation device that has a "control means 104 for moving the sample stage 103 in the horizontal direction, control means 106 for opening and closing the shutter" (Arai: paragraphs 39, 41). In regards to Fig. 3, Arai discloses a structure of the evaporation chamber (A) 506 that allows the evaporation sources to be switched according to the kind of organic materials to be deposited (Arai: paragraph 51). In particular, a preparatory chamber 508, which stores multiple kinds of evaporation cells, is connected to the evaporation chamber (A) 506 so that its interior transferring mechanism can replace an evaporation cell in 506 with an evaporation cell in 508 (Arai: paragraph 52). Even if one were to assume that the "interior transferring mechanism" is a means adapted to move the first, second, and third evaporation sources, as stated in the Office Action, Arai does not teach or suggest that "an evaporation is performed while at least one of the means adapted to move the first, second, and third evaporation sources moves in the film formation chamber," as recited in independent claims 1, 13, and 19. In particular, there is

Applicant: Shunpei Yamazaki et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-0228001 / US7116

Serial No.: 10/826,920 Filed: April 19, 2004 Page: 11 of 12

no teaching or suggestion in Arai that an evaporation is performed while the "interior transferring mechanism" moves in the evaporation chamber (A) 506.

Further, applicants submit that Aoshima, which is cited for its teachings regarding the means adapted to move the first, second, and third evaporation sources (at Figs. 1-2, paragraph 20), does not cure this deficiency. Aoshima discloses a device to provide an organic thin film forming device for an organic EL display element (Aoshima: Abstract). Aoshima also discloses a transferring mechanism 15 for transferring an evaporation source 21 to an evaporation chamber 11 (Aoshima: Figs. 1-2, paragraph 20). However, Aoshima does not teach or suggest that an evaporation is performed while a transferring mechanism 15 moves in the evaporation chamber 11. Therefore, applicants submit that neither Arai nor Aoshima, nor any proper combination of the two, discloses or suggests at least this feature.

For at least these reasons, applicants ask that the rejection of independent claims 1, 13 and 19, and dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 14-15, 17, 21, 23-24, 29 and 31-32, be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

# 35 U.S.C. 103(a) - Claims 7-9, 11-12 and 30

Regarding the rejection of claims 7-9, 11, 12 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai, Aoshima, and Konuma, applicants respectfully submit that neither Arai, Aoshima, Konuma, nor any proper combination of the three, discloses or properly suggests all of the limitations of independent claim 7, as amended.

Page 9 of the Office Action states that because Arai and Aoshima "fail to disclose the apparatus comprising an aligning means that aligns a mask and a substrate" Konuma (at paragraphs 46, 47) can be used in combination with Ari and Aoshima to remedy this deficiency. For the sake of argument, even if Konuma taught this feature, which the applicants do not concede, Konuma, like Arai and Aoshima, does not describe or suggest that "an evaporation is performed while at least one of the means adapted to move the first, second, and third evaporation sources moves in the film formation chamber," as recited in independent claim 7. Konuma is silent with respect to these recited features. Therefore, applicants submit that neither Arai, Aoshima, Konuma, nor any proper combination of the three, discloses or suggests at least this feature.

Applicant: Shunpei Yamazaki et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-0228001 / US7116

Serial No.: 10/826,920 Filed : April 19, 2004 Page : 12 of 12

For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 7, and its dependent claims 8, 9, 11, 12 and 30.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

#### Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

No fee is believed to be due for the filing of this paper on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Dwight U. Thompson/ Date: March 26, 2009

Dwight U. Thompson Reg. No. 53,688

Fish & Richardson P.C. 1425 K Street, N.W. 11th Floor Washington, DC 20005-3500 Telephone: (202) 783-5070 Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

40554144.doc